



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 12

Serial Number: 965,427
Filing Date: 10/23/92
Appellant(s): Septimiu E. Salcudean et al.

95-1357
Cecil A. Rowley
For Appellant

MAILED
SEP 07 1994
GROUP 260

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Supplemental Examiner's Answer

1. On pages 1-2 applicant's brief in response to the examiner's answer, applicant respectively argues the same issues as those of applicant's appeal brief. Examiner already rebutted all those arguments in examiner's answer.

Applicant again cites case law to argue that the prior arts provide no suggestion of desirability of making the invention, examiner disagrees with applicant's opinion. Since the broad teachings of Cadoz et al suggest that resistive feedback can be provided to users, by magnetic force applying means, on some input devices including input devices such as joystick with two degrees of freedom as pointed out by Cadoz col 7 lines 4-6. Clark broadly teaches an input device with two degrees of freedom, thus it would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cadoz to the device of Clark so that resistive feedback can be provided to users as suggested by Cadoz.

2. Applicant states that the teaching in the examiner's answer page 6 line 16 to 19 can not be found in the cited reference and it is not obvious from the references, also applicant questions what the constant force is generated for.

Examiner would like to restate this statement, it would have been obvious to make the projected area of the magnetic field constant so that unanimous force could be generated within the

Serial Number: 07/965427

-3-

Art Unit: 2609

range where the platform moves since it would provide more stability to the platform instead of causing the platform instable moving; also, the force generated by the coils would have to be either constant or variable since this would be the only two choices depending on what the device is used for, either could be used.

Applicant raises a question about a statement made by the examiner which states that it is a well known practice to provide users constant feedback in designing input device with tactile feedback (shown in the examiner's answer). Examiner would like to restate this also, the force generated by the coils would have to be either constant or variable since this would be the only two choices depending on what the device is used for, either could be used.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6739.



ALVIN E. OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 269

Vivian Chang *q.c.*
September 6, 1994